

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

DENNIS BAHAM,

Plaintiff,

vs.

OFFICE OF THE EX-OFFICIO LAS VEGAS  
TOWNSHIP, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-00912-GMN-EJY

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION  
TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE REPLIES**

Pending before the Court is the Joint Motion to Extend Time to File Replies, (ECF No. 58), filed by Defendants Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, NewRez LLC d/b/a Shellpoint Mortgage Servicing (“NewRez”), McCarthy & Holthus, Kristen Schuler-Hintz, Las Vegas Township Constable’s Office, and Elana Graham. Plaintiff Dennis Baham filed a Response, (ECF No. 59), to which Defendants replied, (ECF No. 61). For good cause appearing, the Court GRANTS the Joint Motion to Extend Time to File Replies.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1), a court may extend the time to file documents for “‘good cause,’ a non-rigorous standard that has been construed broadly across procedural and statutory contexts.” *Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010). Requests made for an extension of time before the applicable deadline has passed should “normally. . . be granted in the absence of bad faith on the part of the party seeking relief or prejudice to the adverse party.” *Id.* (quoting 4B Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1165 (3d ed. 2004)).

Defendants filed the instant motion on November 3, 2025, one day before their Replies were originally due, and argued that an extension was necessary because counsel for NewRez was traveling out of the country. (*See* Joint Mot. Extend Time 1:21–2:2, ECF No. 58). In his Response, Plaintiff argued that he would be prejudiced by an extension of the deadline to file

1 Replies because the case would be delayed. (*See* Resp. at 2, ECF No. 59). However, the Court  
2 does not find that Plaintiff would be prejudiced by the granting of this motion. Moreover, the  
3 record does not indicate, nor does Plaintiff allege bad faith by Defendants.

4 Accordingly,

5 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants' Joint Motion to Extend Time to  
6 File Replies, (ECF No. 58), is **GRANTED**. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants'  
7 Replies in support of the pending Motions to Dismiss (ECF Nos. 38, 42, 44, 45) are now due by  
8 November 18, 2025.

9 **DATED** this 17 day of November, 2025.

10  
11   
12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge  
14 United States District Court  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25